

REMARKS

I. Status Of The Claims

Claims 1-62 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1 and 32 are objected to because of informalities.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10, 15, 32-35, 37, 39, 41, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Skladman (U.S. Patent No. 6,400,810)

Claims 5 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Kaars (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0059384).

Claims 7, 9, 12, 38, 40, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Reed (U.S. Patent No. 5,862,325).

Claims 11 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Dillon (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,561).

Claims 13, 14, 44, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of McKinley (U.S. Patent No. 4,926,326).

Claims 16 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Wong (U.S. Patent No. 5,542,115).

Claims 17, 18, 20, 22, 24, 29, 30, 48, 49, 51, 53, 55, 60, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0041265).

Claims 19 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier and Kaars.

Claims 21, 23, 26, 52, 54, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier and Reed.

Claims 25 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier and Dillon.

Claims 27, 28, 58, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier and McKinley.

Claims 31 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier and Wong.

Claims 1, 17, 32, and 48 are independent.

With this response claims 1 and 32 are amended.

II. Objection to Claims 1 and 32

The Office Action, stating that:

“... Applicant specifies ‘said user to’ twice on line 7 of claim 1 and line 12 of claim 32”,

objects to claims 1 and 32.

With this response Applicants amend claims 1 and 32 to remove an instance of “said user to” in each, and respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as “contain[ing] subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention”. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim is in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is apparently directed towards “wherein displaying is performed while a user interface of said node is in an idle state” and “freezing display” of claim 1.

With regard to “wherein displaying is performed while a user interface of said node is in an idle state” of claim 1, Applicants observe that the disclosure of the present application states, for example, that:

“[a]fter determining that it should inform its user of the occurrence of an event, the node could take action to so inform its user while its user interface is in an idle state. The functionality whereby the node could inform its user could be implemented in a number of ways. For example, as alluded to above, the node could act to inform its user by way of a screensaver or the like”
(see page 14 of the disclosure; emphasis added).

With regard to “freezing display” of claim 1, Applicants observe that the disclosure of the present application states, for example, that:

“...in various embodiments the node could act to capture the current visual state of the screensaver or the like providing event information, and to display the captured visual state in a manner that allows the user to select the portions of the visual state corresponding to one or more events in order to select those events for corresponding operations”
(see page 17 of the disclosure; emphasis added).

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 be withdrawn.

As Applicants believe that the foregoing addresses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, Applicants do not believe it necessary at this time to address any characterizations of the claims that may be set forth in that rejection. Applicants, however, reserve the right to address any such characterizations in the future should such be deemed necessary and appropriate.

IV. Rejection of Independent Claims 1 and 32

The Office Action rejects independent claims 1 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Skladman. However, Skladman fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all aspects of those claims.

For example, Skladman fails to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... displaying to said user ... wherein displaying is performed while a user interface of said node is in an idle state”
(emphasis added)

as set forth in each of claims 1 and 32.

As noted above, the disclosure of the present application states, for example, that:

“[a]fter determining that it should inform its user of the occurrence of an event, the node could take action to so inform its user while its user interface is in an idle state. The functionality whereby the node could inform its user could be implemented in a number of ways. For example, as alluded to above, the node could act to inform its user by way of a screensaver or the like”
(see page 14 of the disclosure; emphasis added).

The Office Action contends that the foregoing aspect of each of claims 1 and 32 is disclosed at col. 3 lines 37-40 of Skladman. However, Applicants observe that neither col. 3 lines 37-40 nor any other portion of Skladman makes any disclosure, teaching, or suggestion of such functionality.

As another example, Skladman fails to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... freezing display of said notifications ...”

as set forth in each of claims 1 and 32.

As noted above, the disclosure of the present application states, for example, that:

“...in various embodiments the node could act to capture the current visual state of the screensaver or the like providing event information, and to display the captured visual state in

a manner that allows the user to select the portions of the visual state corresponding to one or more events in order to select those events for corresponding operations”
(see page 17 of the disclosure; emphasis added).

The Office Action contends that the foregoing aspect of each of claims 1 and 32 is disclosed at col. 3 lines 27-47 of Skladman. However, Applicants observe that neither col. 3 lines 27-47 nor any other portion of Skladman makes any disclosure, teaching, or suggestion of such functionality.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 32, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

V. Rejection of Independent Claims 17 and 48

The Office Action rejects claims 17 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all aspects of those claims.

For example, the cited references fail to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“...wherein maintaining, receiving, and displaying are performed while a user interface of said node is in an idle state”
(emphasis added)

as set forth in each of claims 17 and 48.

The Office Action contends that such functionality is disclosed at col. 3 lines 37-40 of Skladman. However Applicants, with reference to their remarks made above with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), submit that Skladman fails to disclose, teach, or suggest such functionality. Applicants further submit that Lagimonier fails to disclose, teach, or suggest such functionality.

As another example, the cited references fail to disclose, teach, or suggest “messages to be bypassed” as set forth in each of claims 17 and 48.

The Office Action contends that such is disclosed by the Abstract of Skladman. However, Applicants submit that the Abstract of Skladman fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “messages to be bypassed” (emphasis added), and instead discusses “incoming e-mail messages” (see Abstract of Skladman; emphasis added).

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 17 and 48, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

VI. Dependent Claim Rejections

Applicants do not believe it is necessary at this time to further address the rejections of the dependent claims as Applicants believe that the foregoing places the independent claims in condition for allowance. Applicants, however, reserve the right to further address those rejections in the future should such a response be deemed necessary and appropriate.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that this Application is in condition for allowance for which action is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of this Application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

(Continued on next page)

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No.

4208-4139. **A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.**


Furthermore, in the event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-noted Deposit Account and Order No.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: December 20, 2004

By:



Angus R. Gill
Registration No. 51,133

Mailing Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, New York 10281-2101
(212) 415-8746
(212) 415-8701 (Fax)